

## REMARKS

In the above-referenced Office action, Applicant was reminded to provide an abstract of the disclosure in proper language and format. In response, Applicant replaces the original abstract with a new abstract in the instant amendment to satisfy the examiner.

In the same Office action, the examiner objected to the title of the instant application as not being descriptive. In response, Applicant has replaced the original title with a new title that is descriptive of the invention that is being claimed in the claims of the instant application. Independent claim 1 recites a CCD image detector and independent claim 11 recites a method of operating a CCD as an image detector. In view of the new title, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

In the same Office action, the examiner found the difference between the separate reference numbers 40 and 42 shown in Figure 2 as being unclear in the specification and suggested amending the specification, at all appropriate instances, to clearly distinguish between each reference sign as they are distinguished in Figure 2. In response, Applicant has amended paragraphs 16, 17, 21 and 25 to cancel the word “detector” from the term “CCD detector 42”. In all other instances in the specification, reference numeral 40 refers to a CCD image detector and reference numeral 42 refers to a CCD thereof. In view of the amendments to paragraphs 16, 17, 21 and 25 of the specification, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

In the same Office action, Figure 1 was objected to as not having a legend such as “Prior Art” because only that which is considered old is illustrated in Figure 1. In response, a corrected drawing, labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the header thereof, in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) is being submitted herewith to replace the originally submitted Figure 1. If the change to Figure 1 is accepted, a set of formal drawings of Figures 1-4, including the change to Figure 1, is included to replace the originally submitted informal drawings of Figures 1-4. Accordingly, the objection to Figure 1 should be withdrawn.

In the same Office action, independent claim 11 was objected to because of lack of clarity and precision. The examiner offered recommended amendments to alleviate the problem. In

response, Applicant amended claim 11 to include the amendments suggested by the examiner. Accordingly, the objection to claim 11 should be withdrawn.

In the same Office action, independent claims 1 and 11 and dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7-10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 5, 781, 234, David et al. In addition, dependent claims 3, 6, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over David et al. Dependent claims 12-18 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, independent claim 11 was rewritten to include the limitations of allowable dependent claim 12 to render dependent claim 12 in independent form. In addition, independent claim 1 was also amended to be consistent with the limitations of allowable dependent claim 12 to render it allowable. Dependent claim 12 was cancelled. In addition, dependent claims 5, 7, and 9-10 were also cancelled because the subject matter thereof is considered embraced by amended independent claim 1. Dependent claims 6 and 8 were amended to change the claim dependency from claim 5 which was cancelled to claim 1. Dependent claims 13 and 14 were amended to change the claim dependency thereof from claim 12 which was cancelled to claim 11 and dependent claim 15 was amended to render the recitation thereof consistent with the amendments to independent claim 11. Finally, dependent claim 17 was amended to render the recitation thereof more definite in particularly pointing out the invention intended to be claimed thereby.

Accordingly, since both amended independent claims 1 and 11 now include the limitations of allowable dependent claim 12, they are considered allowable and the remaining claims 2-4, 6 and 8 dependent from amended claim 1 and claims 13-20 dependent from amended claim 11 are all also considered allowable for the same reasons given for their respective parent or base claims. Thus, the anticipation and obviousness rejections thereof should all be withdrawn.

The other reference to Harada, of record, was found not to materially affect the patentability of the amended and remaining claims of the instant application.

In view of the above, the instant application is considered in proper form for allowance and therefore, an early issuance thereof is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William E. Zitelli  
Reg. No. 28,551  
Attorney for Applicants